

D R A F T

Meeting Minutes, 11/28/05

Committee for Citizen Involvement

CCI Members Present: Sue Carver, Basil Christopher, Teddi Duling, Bev Froude, Brian Kelly, Rick Parker, Trisha Swanson, Bill Scheiderich

CCI Members Absent: Stacie Yost

Staff Present: Liz Newton, Vannie Nguyen, Duane Roberts

1. Welcome and Introductions

Committee Chair Basil Christopher called the meeting to order at 7:05 PM.

2. Approval of Minutes

As a time saver, Basil asked committee members to send any minute corrections directly to Duane. [None received.]

3. Downtown UR Plan Presentation

Basil opened the floor to Gretchen Buehner, who introduced herself as a member of the City Center Advisory Commission (CCAC), a Council-appointed group composed of 14 citizens. She proceeded to discuss the work of the CCAC and to outline the main features of the City Center Urban Renewal Plan that the Commission recently had completed and forwarded to Council for its consideration and adoption. Gretchen described the urban renewal plan as a finance mechanism for carrying out the Downtown Improvement Plan developed over a three year period by another group, the Downtown Improvement Plan Task Force. Urban renewal will be used to finance the public improvements identified in the Downtown Plan. The UR Plan does not provide the authority to condemn land for private development. This does not limit the City's authority to condemn land for public improvements.

The City Municipal Code requires voter approval when any urban renewal plan includes the use of tax increment financing. An election on the City Center Urban Renewal Plan, which includes this funding mechanism, is set for May 16, 2006. As explained by Gretchen, tax increment financing means that the taxes on any increase in property values within the district would be used to finance public improvements within the district. She emphasized that property taxes will not increase should tax increment financing be authorized. No new taxes will be levied to pay for urban renewal. Tax increment financing is a revenue redistribution process, as opposed to a new property tax.

Future school district dollars foregone as result of the freezing of the tax base within the downtown area will be backfilled by additional revenue from the Oregon School Fund. The impact of tax increment financing on school funding will be zero. On the other hand, the other tax districts with territory in the downtown will forego revenue during the use of tax increment financing. Foregone revenue consists of revenue on growth in assessed value within the urban renewal district.

Stacie asked if it were true that without urban renewal, properties within the urban renewal area would not have increased in value in the first place. Gretchen agreed, noting that as an outcome of successful urban renewal, property values within the district are expected to increase significantly. Without urban renewal, property values could be expected to increase slowly or not at all. She went on to note that the taxes on the increase in value will be used to pay off the debt on bonds used to finance public improvements within the area. She pointed out that any proposed increase in the maximum amount of indebtedness of \$22 million set out in the plan must be approved by the voters. The \$22 million is an absolute amount. It is not adjusted for inflation over the twenty year life of the plan.

With regard to governance, Gretchen explained that the CCAC is advisory to Council, which presently serves as the City Center Development Agency (CCDA). The CCDA decides which projects will be funded.

Bev commented that the downtown owners were supportive of the plan. Efforts were made to contact all land and business owners during the plan's development. No organized opposition among this or any other group has emerged to the UR Plan so far.

4. Neighborhood Program Update

Liz Newton, Assistant to the City Manager, gave background detail on the Neighborhood Program pilot program. Some 55 people have expressed an interest in participating in a work group to develop the details of the program. She envisions the CCI's role as monitoring the process for developing the Neighborhood Program. During the next year, the work group will work with three neighborhood pilot groups to flesh out the details of the Neighborhood Program.

Liz defined the Neighborhood Program as the citizen's tool to connect with each other and address neighborhood issues. Potential topics or focus areas could include, among many others, neighborhood safety, National Night Out, Neighborhood Watch, funding for neighborhood aesthetic improvements, and special status to testify at Planning Commission and City Council land use hearings. Neighborhood recreation is another potential area of interest. Priorities will be set by the individual neighborhood.

Basil asked about the location of the three pilot neighborhoods. Liz responded that the three include Summerfield, the NW corner of Scholls (the Castle Hill area), and Metzger. The areas each reflect a different character. Bev commented that there are similarities and differences between the three.

Basil suggested the City support a separate webpage for each neighborhood organization. He noted that high school students may be interested in helping out with the creation and maintenance of these webpages.

Liz concluded by saying that she will report back to the CCI every two months.

5. Capital Improvement Program Public Involvement Program

Vannie Ngyuen, Tigard Engineering Manager, introduced this topic. Tigard's annual capital improvement program (CIP) planning process begins six months before Council adoption of the CIP in June. The CIP includes street, sanitary sewer, storm drainage, City facility, park system, and water system projects. This year, the first public meeting is scheduled for December 7th. A second public meeting to review the proposed CIP will follow on January 25th in Town Hall.

Basil asked what level of detail the public needs to provide in order to nominate a project. He also asked how often citizen project nominations are picked for CIP funding. Vannie responded that staff's first obligation is to document and respond to concerns and project nominations. The public can participate in the CIP process by identifying a problem, without knowing what the solution might be. Staff investigates in the field most problems brought to staff's attention. A written report containing all nominations and staff responses is submitted to Council. As part of the public participation process, the public has the opportunity to testify in the Council CIP Hearing.

Bev commented that both big and little projects are discussed in the annual December CIP kick-off meeting.

Duane asked why a preliminary list of projects is compiled prior to the first public meeting, as opposed to staff going into the meeting with a blank slate, as it were. The drawback of presenting a preliminary, staff-initiated project list at the public meeting is that its use could give the impression that the CIP is a "done deal" or foregone conclusion. Vannie responded that the staff list includes only carry over projects from the previous year and obligatory projects tied to specific funding sources. An example of an obligatory project is a HWY 99 Transportation Growth Management Study funded by a state grant. The preliminary list does not include any discretionary projects put forward by staff. It is only fair for the public to be made aware of these "committed projects" and of the City's degree of flexibility in adding new projects. Undertaking the public

involvement process without providing this information would present an unrealistic and inaccurate picture. The public would not be served by not fully disclosing the limitations on the use of City CIP dollars. The amount of discretionary funding available each year is limited.

Brian and Basil both commented on the need for a public meeting where people are not reacting to a list. Bev stated that the CIP should include some new projects every year.

Trisha asked how many community members participated in last year's CIP process. Vannie responded that very few attended last year's initial CIP meeting.

Brian commented that the key to getting the public involved is through the neighborhood process. Hearing others with the same concern is valuable for the individual with a concern and to neighborhood "cross fertilization."

Vannie commented that staff tries very hard to get the public involved, but that very little participation is the rule. Projects are listed on the City webpage.

6. CCI/Council Communications

Duane informed the CCI that he is compiling a list of committee recommendations for improving City communications and public involvement. The recommendations are drawn from the meeting minutes and cover the range of topics considered by the Committee during the past year. When completed, the list will be presented to the group for review and approval. The approved list will be forwarded to Council for their consideration and action. *[Note: The annual joint meeting with Council is set for Tuesday, February 21st. Thirty minutes have been allotted for the workshop meeting.]*

7. Other Business/Announcements/December Agenda.

The group voted to not meet in December. The next regular CCI meeting will be on January 19, 2006, in the Red Rock Conference Room.

Basil adjourned the meeting at 8:35 PM.